

REMARKS

This paper is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 25, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 25, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests entry and consideration of the following remarks. Applicant request a One-Month Extension of Time and has paid the associated fees.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the Application.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 5-12, and 14-17 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehsani et al. (US 2002/0032564) in view of Valles (US 2004/0083092).

Applicant's claim 1 teaches method of generating a spoken dialogue application. The method includes generating application code for functions to be executed upon state transitions in said generated finite state machine, wherein said generated application code for said functions are executable during runtime of said spoken dialogue system. The finite state machine generates the application code. Thus, the application code is generated dependent on how the finite state machine is traversed. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 6, paragraph 25].

Ehsani does not teach that the finite state machine generates the dialogue application code. Ehsani teaches that the dialogue finite state machine is programmed to generate a response to each instruction passed on to the finite state machine. The finite state machine must interact with a user interface that has predesigned scripts. [See Ehsani, paragraphs 0215 and 0216]

In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 teaches using a finite state machine that generates dialogue function code based in the requirements of the call flow diagram. The code is executable in run time as the finite state machine is generating the dialogue function code. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 7, paragraph 0031].

Valles teaches a method for developing conversational application dialog. Valles also teaches using context free grammar for the developments of the dialog. [See Valles, abstract].

The combination of Valles and Ehsani fails to teach the elements of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 1 teaches past the art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-9 depend upon claim 1. Therefore, claims 5-9 incorporate the elements of claim 1. Applicant believes, for the reasons stated above, that claims 5-9 teach past the art of record.

Claim 10 teaches a computer-readable medium that stores a program for controlling a computer device to perform a method for generating a spoken dialogue application. The method includes generating application code. The generated application code is executable during the runtime of the spoken dialogue system. [See Applicant's claim 10]

The finite state machine generates the application code. Thus, the application code is generated dependent on how the finite state machine is traversed. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 6, paragraph 25].

Ehsani does not teach that the finite state machine generates the dialogue application code. Ehsani teaches that the dialogue finite state machine is programmed to generate a response to each instruction passed on to the finite state machine. The finite state machine must interact with a user interface that has predesigned scripts. [See Ehsani, paragraphs 0215 and 0216]

In contrast, Applicant's claim 10 teaches using a finite state machine that generates dialogue function code based in the requirements of the call flow diagram. The code is executable in run time as the finite state machine is generating the dialogue function code. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 7, paragraph 0031].

Valles teaches a method for developing conversational application dialog. Valles also teaches using context free grammar for the developments of the dialog. [See Valles, abstract].

The combination of Valles and Ehsani fails to teach the elements of claim 10. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 10 teaches past the art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 teaches a system for generating a spoken dialogue application using a method that comprises generating application code for functions to be executed upon state transitions in

said generated finite state machine. Said generated application code for said functions are executable during runtime of said spoken dialog system. [See Applicant's claim 11]. The finite state machine generates the application code. Thus, the application code is generated dependent on how the finite state machine is traversed. [See Applicant's Original Specification page 6, paragraph 25].

Ehsani does not teach that the finite state machine generates the dialogue application code. Ehsani teaches that the dialogue finite state machine is programmed to generate a response to each instruction passed on to the finite state machine. The finite state machine must interact with a user interface that has predesigned scripts. [See Ehsani, paragraphs 0215 and 0216]

In contrast, Applicant's claim 11 teaches using a finite state machine that generates dialogue function code based in the requirements of the call flow diagram. The code is executable in run time as the finite state machine is generating the dialogue function code. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 7, paragraph 0031].

Valles teaches a method for developing conversational application dialog. Valles also teaches using context free grammar for the developments of the dialog. [See Valles, abstract].

The combination of Valles and Ehsani fails to teach the elements of claim 11. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 11 teaches past the art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 teaches traversing a finite state machine generated from a context free grammar representation of a call flow for a spoken dialog system, and invoking generated application code.

The finite state machine generates the application code. Thus, the application code is generated dependent on how the finite state machine is traversed. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 6, paragraph 25].

Ehsani does not teach that the finite state machine generates the dialogue application code. Ehsani teaches that the dialogue finite state machine is programmed to generate a response to each instruction passed on to the finite state machine. The finite state machine must interact

with a user interface that has predesigned scripts. [See Ehsani, paragraphs 0215 and 0216]

In contrast, Applicant's claim 12 teaches using a finite state machine that generates dialogue function code based in the requirements of the call flow diagram. The code is executable in run time as the finite state machine is generating the dialogue function code. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 7, paragraph 0031].

Valles teaches a method for developing conversational application dialog. Valles also teaches using context free grammar for the developments of the dialog. [See Valles, abstract].

The combination of Valles and Ehsani fails to teach the elements of claim 12. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 12 teaches past the art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-16 depend upon claim 12. Claims 14-16 incorporate the elements of claim 12. Therefore Applicant believes that claims 14-16 teach past the art of record and are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 teaches a spoken dialog system comprising a means for invoking generated application code for functions associated with nodes in said finite state machine. The application code is invoked and generated by the finite state machine. Thus, the application code is generated dependent on how the finite state machine is traversed. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 6, paragraph 25].

Ehsani does not teach that the finite state machine generates the dialogue application code. Ehsani teaches that the dialogue finite state machine is programmed to generate a response to each instruction passed on to the finite state machine. The finite state machine must interact with a user interface that has predesigned scripts. [See Ehsani, paragraphs 0215 and 0216]

In contrast, Applicant's claim 17 teaches using a finite state machine that generates dialogue function code based in the requirements of the call flow diagram. The code is invoked in run time as the finite state machine is generating the dialogue function code. [See Applicant's Original Specification, page 7, paragraph 0031].

Valles teaches a method for developing conversational application dialog. Valles also

teaches using context free grammar for the developments of the dialog. [See Valles, abstract].

The combination of Valles and Ehsani fails to teach the elements of claim 17. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 17 teaches past the art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 3, and 13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehsani et al. (US 2002/0032564) in view of Valles (US 2004/0083092) as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Marx et al. (US 6,173,266).

Claims 2 and 3 depend upon claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 3 incorporate the elements of claim 1.

Marx teaches a method for development of speech application dialog and using graphics to represent a call flow. [See Marx, abstract, lines 13-16].

For the reasons stated above, in the discussion of claim 1, Ehsani and Valles fail to teach the elements of claims 2 and 3. Marx further fails to teach all the elements of claim 1. Since claims 2 and 3 incorporate the elements of claim 1, Applicant believes that claims 2 and 3 each teach past the art of record and are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 depends upon claim 12. Therefore, claim 13 incorporates the elements of claim 12.

For the reasons stated above in the discussion of claim 12, the combination of Ehsani and Valles fail to teach all the elements of claim 12. Marx further fails to teach all the elements of claim 12. Since claim 13 incorporates all the elements of claim 12, Applicant believes that claim 12 teaches past the art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehsani et al. (US 2002/0032564) in view of Valles (US 2004/0083092) as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Marx et al. (US 6,173,266) and Yuschik (US 7,139,706).

Claim 4 depends on claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 incorporates the elements of claim 1.

For the reasons stated above Ehsani and Valles fail to teach all the elements of claim 1. Further Marx fails to teach all the elements of claim 1.

Yuschik teaches a method for developing automatic speech interface and using Visio for simulation of ASR and prompting dialog. [See Yuschik, abstract, and column 14, lines 43-53]. Yuschik fails to teach all the elements of claim 1.

The combination of Ehsani, Valles, Marx, and Yushik fails to teach all the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 teaches past the prior art of record and is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time and attention to this matter. Applicant believes no new matter has been added with any amendments that have been made and the claims, as now provided, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 17, 2007

Wendy K. Buskop
Registration. No. 32,202

Please mail correspondence to the address associated with **customer number 26652**.

Mr. John Etchells
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921